DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 818 TM 000 108

TITLE	Draft: Appendices for Joint Federal/State Task Force on Evaluation Comprehensive Evaluation System--Current Status and Development Requirements.
INSTITUTION	Scientific Educational Systems, Inc., Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 70
NOTE	62p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.20
DESCRIPTORS	*Evaluation, Evaluation Criteria, Evaluation Needs, Evaluation Techniques, *Federal Programs, *Federal State Relationship, Measurement, *Measurement Instruments, *Program Evaluation, State Agencies, State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Belmont Group Project, Elementary and Secondary Education Act, ESEA, JCES, *Joint Comprehensive Evaluation System, National Defense Education Act, NDEA, Vocational Education Amendments Act

ABSTRACT

This document includes the appendices to the report listed above (TM 000 107). Appendix A is a copy of the Belmont Agreement, and Appendix B a list of the twenty states in the Belmont Group. In Appendix C, a detailed summary of all the legislative titles covered by the Joint Comprehensive Evaluation System (JCES) is given. Appendix D includes a further consideration of the evaluation questions covered in the main report. The final appendix discusses in detail all of the JCES instruments. (DG)

ED 042818

Scientific Educational Systems, Inc.
SUITE 607
910 17TH STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20006
202 833-8028

D R A F T

APPENDICES FOR

JOINT FEDERAL/STATE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

COMPREHENSIVE EVALUATION SYSTEM

CURRENT STATUS AND DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

PREPARED FOR

THE JOINT FEDERAL/STATE TASK FORCE ON EVALUATION

AND SUBMITTED TO

THE U. S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION

WASHINGTON, D. C.

BY

SCIENTIFIC EDUCATIONAL SYSTEMS, INC.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 8, 1970

TM 000 108

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Appendix A . . . . . The Belmont Agreement

Appendix B . . . . . The Belmont States and Their Representation

Appendix C . . . . . Summary of Legislative Titles Covered

Appendix D . . . . . Further Consideration of Evaluation Questions

Appendix E . . . . . The JCES Instruments

APPENDIX A

The Belmont Agreement

Cooperative Arrangement for Evaluation of
Elementary & Secondary School Programs

In recognition of their common concern for effective evaluation of elementary and secondary education programs in the United States, the Council of Chief State School Officers and the Commissioner of Education of the United States agree:

I. GENERAL:

a. Within the context of present Federal programs, jointly to develop and install a common survey instrument that is designed to meet the basic and common management requirements of the Office of Education and State Education Agencies for evaluation of elementary and secondary education programs;

b. Jointly, to develop and install pilot training programs for evaluation personnel in State and local education agencies; and

c. Jointly, to develop and implement a long-range program of general and evaluative information for elementary and secondary education in the United States.

II. TYPES OF DATA:

The common survey instrument would be used to aid in the evaluation of all or portions of the following Federal programs: ESEA I, II, III, V, VI, VII, VIII: NDEA III and V-A, and relevant parts of Vocational Education.

The instrument would be confined to those principal classes of information that are deemed to be crucial to the management interests both of State Education Agencies and the Office of Education. Reasonable standards of validity and reliability will govern the choice of

specific items to be included.

III. PARTICIPATION:

It is understood that in FY 69 only a broadly representative group of States--mutually agreed upon--will participate in a pilot instrument development and implementation effort.

IV. USES OF DATA:

Data produced under this agreement will be available freely to the participating States and the Office of Education.

It is understood that the results of any "anchor" tests that may be developed will be applied by the Office of Education in those States mutually agreed upon by a joint OE/CSSO policy level task force.

V. IMPLEMENTATION:

The instrument development and pilot program will proceed as rapidly as possible.

VI. PARTICIPATION OF LEAs IN PILOT PROGRAM:

It is understood that each participating State will arrange for representative LEAs to become involved in the instrument development and pilot programs.

AUGUST 29, 1968

APPENDIX B

The Belmont States and their Representation

The Twenty States Included in the Belmont Group Are:

		REPRESENTATIVES
1.	Washington	1
2.	California	1
3.	Texas	1
4.	Colorado	1
5.	North Dakota	1
6.	South Dakota	1
7.	Minnesota	2
8.	Wisconsin	1
9.	Michigan	1
10.	Illinois (inactive) Replaced by Pennsylvania	3
11.	Kentucky	1
12.	Ohio	1
13.	New York	2
14.	New Jersey	2
15.	Connecticut	1
16.	Georgia	1
17.	Florida	1

18.	Maryland	2
19.	North Carolina	2
20.	South Carolina	1

* * * * * * * * *

There are 17 representatives from the U.S. Office of Education to the Belmont Group.

APPENDIX C

SUMMARY OF LEGISLATIVE TITLES COVERED

Federal support for education takes place under a number of legislative Titles. The substance of each of the Titles with which the JCES is presently concerned is presented in this Appendix. The purpose of this summary is to give some indication of the types of educational programs and services that are to be evaluated by the JCES.

The extractions below were taken from Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs, U.S.O.E., March 1969, and from the legislative Titles themselves. The names of the Titles that are summarized are as follows:

1. ESEA of 1965, Title I: Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children

2. ESEA of 1965, Title II: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and other Instructional Materials

3. ESEA of 1965, Title III: Supplementary Educational Centers and Services

4. ESEA of 1965, Title V: Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education

5. ESEA of 1965, Title VII: Bilingual Education Programs

6. ESEA of 1965, Title VIII: Dropout Prevention Program

7. NDEA of 1958, Title III: Strengthening Instruction in Critical Subjects

8. NDEA of 1958, Title V-A: Counseling, Guidance and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students

9. Civil Rights Act of 1964, Title IV: Equal Educational Opportunities

10. Follow Through (Part of ESEA, 1965, Title I)

11. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968.

1. ESEA of 1965, Title I: Special Programs for Educationally Deprived Children

This title offers financial assistance to State and local educational agencies to expand and improve their educational programs for:

- educationally disadvantaged children in low-income areas
- handicapped, neglected, delinquent, and foster children
- children of migratory agricultural workers
- American Indian children attending Bureau of Indian Affairs schools

Programs are designed to give special educational assistance to children whose educational levels are below normal. Projects may provide such services as supplementary and remedial instruction in reading and mathematics, pupil and family counseling, cultural enrichment, and pre-school activities.

Approximately 9.2 million disadvantaged children in 16,000 school districts participated during FY68. A total of $1.12 Billion

was allocated for FY69 programs.

2. ESEA of 1965, Title II: School Library Resources, Textbooks, and other Instructional Materials

The purpose of this Title is to improve instruction by providing funds to States for school library resources, textbooks, and other printed and published instructional materials for the use of children and teachers in public and private elementary and secondary schools. Funds may be used to purchase books, periodicals, documents, pamphlets, photographs, reproductions, pictorial or graphic works, musical scores, maps, charts, globes, sound recordings, processed slides, transparencies, films, filmstrips, kinescopes, and video tapes. Excluded are equipment and furniture, materials intended for religious instruction, and materials consumed in use or those which cannot be expected to last for more than one year.

Almost 44.6 million children and 1.8 million teachers participated in this program in 1969. For FY68 and FY69, $99 million and $50 million, respectively, were made available under this program.

3. ESEA of 1965, Title III: Supplementary Educational Center and Services

The purpose of this program is to stimulate school districts to seek creative solutions to their educational problems. This program is also known as PACE (Projects to Advance Creativity in Education). Funds may be requested for innovative and exemplary applications of new educational knowledge or for vitally needed supplementary services.

The following types of projects are funded: improved programs for deprived inner city children; programs of individualized instruction for self-paced learning; early childhood educational programs; program of quality education for minority group children and children in geographically isolated areas; special programs for handicapped children; development of planning and evaluation competence.

A total of $165 million was allocated in FY 69. There are approximately 1800 projects under this Title which reach 10 million school pupils, 135,00 pre-school children, and 67,000 out of school youths.

4. ESEA of 1965, Title V: Grants to Strengthen State Departments of Education

The purpose of this Title is to aid the State educational agencies in establishing and improving programs to identify and meet their educational needs. The following types of programs are funded: planning and evaluation; data collection and processing; dissemination of information on the condition, progress, and needs of education; research programs; distribution of new curriculum materials; teacher training; use of teacher aids; financing of education; measurement of pupil achievement; improvement of personnel in leadership, administration, and specialist services; consultative and technical services; use of Head Start benefits; comprehensive planning.

$29,750,000 was appropriated for FY68 and the same amount for FY69.

5. ESEA of 1965, Title VII: Bilingual Education Programs

This Title provides funds for educational programs for children 3 to 18 years of age who have limited English-speaking ability and who come from non-English speaking environments. Funding is provided for research projects, development of instructional materials and training of teachers. Funding is also provided for the purchase of teaching materials and equipment.

$7.5 million was appropriated for this program in FY69.

6. ESEA of 1965, Title VIII: Dropout Prevention Program

The purpose of this Title is to develop programs for reducing the number of students who drop out of school. Programs may use innovative methods, systems, or materials which show promise in reducing dropouts.

$5 million was allocated in FY69.

7. NDEA of 1958, Title III: Strengthening Instruction in Critical Subjects

The purpose of this Title is to improve instruction in science, math, foreign language, social studies, economics, English, reading and industrial arts. Funds are available for purchase of laboratory and special equipment, printed materials other than textbooks, and administrative services in the designated subject areas.

In FY69, the appropriations totaled over $78 million for this program.

8. NDEA of 1958, Title V-A: Counseling, Guidance and Testing; Identification and Encouragement of Able Students

The purpose of this program is to provi_ funds for establishing guidance, counseling, and testing programs at elementary and secondary schools, junior colleges, and technical institutes. The funds are used to provide counseling and guidance personnel who are able to assess the abilities of students at an early age, assist students in selecting appropriate courses of study, apprise students of various training requirements and opportunities, and encourage them to continue their education. Funds are also used for programs of pupil personnel services where counselors work with social workers and psychologists to meet the needs of students and to recommend special instructional programs.

The money appropriated for Title V-A was $24.5 million and $17 million for FY68 and FY69 respectively.

9. Civil Rights Act of 1964, IV: Equal Educational Opportunities

The aim of this Title is to assist public school systems cope with school desegregation problems. This is done by grants to school boards for in-service and/or advisory specialist programs, contracts with universities for institutes to improve teacher ability, and technical assistance to State education departments.

Approximately 10,000 school personnel took part in 90 training

programs during FY68. The appropriation for that year was $10 million.

10. Follow Through (Part of Title I, ESEA)

Follow Through is designed to reinforce in the early grades the progress made by children in Head Start and other pre-school programs. The program is designed to meet the instructional, physical, and psychosocial needs of disadvantaged children in a program that combines school and community resources. Special classroom activities and addition staff help meet instructional needs. Nutrition and health care are provided along with social work and psychological services.

The allocations for FY68 and FY69 were $15 million and $30 million respectively. During the 1968-1969 school year, about 91 projects served 23,400 children. Forty-five new projects were funded in 1969-70.

11. Vocational Education Amendments of 1968

The purpose of these amendments is to provide funds to States to help them maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, develop new programs of vocational education, and provide part-time employment for youths who need earnings in order to continue their vocational training. More specifically, funds are granted to States (a) for conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages; (b) for conducting vocational education for the handicapped; (c) for research in vocational education; (d) for development of new curricula; (e) for residential vocational education; (f) for programs in

consumer and homemaking education; and (g) for cooperative work-study programs through local educational agencies and public and private employers.

APPENDIX D

Further Consideration of Evaluation Questions

Assuming that the question of objectives has been satisfactorily resolved, evaluation may be approached from the point of view of programmatic description and also impact. Both of these types of evaluation may also be examined on a multi-level basis. In the first instance, the questions to be asked have to do with the nature and description of the program as implemented, that is, "What is actually being done?" "How does what is actually being done compared to what management intended to be done?" "How many people (districts, communitites, items, objects, etc.) are being reached by the program?" "How many of what kinds of persons are involved in the implementation of the program?" "What do various aspects of the program cost?" Etc.

The second kind of evaluation is more concerned with the measurable impacts of the program (whatever they are, and however the program may differ from the planned) on target groups (and others). It asked questions such as "Can first grade children in this program display superior word attack skills as compared to those not in the program?" "Do children exposed to the program tend to be less prone to drop out than those not exposed?" "Is the attendance of program children better than that of those not in the program?" "Does the program result in a neglect on the part of teachers of some aspect of the curriculum not covered by the program?" Etc.

In addition to the above kinds of evaluation, it is sometimes useful to consider a certain kind of outcome of the program as a separate for evaluation purposes. This is the political and policy impact of the program and/or its existance on various groups such as community leaders, board members, parents, etc. Strictly speaking, such outcome may be classed under impacts of the program, but it is sometimes appropriate to treat then separately from the targeted educational improvement objectives.

The multi-level concept recognizes that Federal programs are rarely unidimensional in design or implementation and that the educational establishment is basically hierarchical in nature. Thus, the institution of guidelines for evaluation at the LEA level also has implications and impact at the SEA level, and, for different reasons, at the Federal level as well. Therefore, the evaluation questions must specify the levels at which they are concerned, and often be applied at more than one level.

In the list of evaluation questions to follow, an effort has been made to keep them at a general enough level so that they may be generalized across programs, legislative titles, and projects. They are divide into the three basic types mentioned above, and an indication of level is given. It should be recognized that the usefulness of the following list is confined to the examination of the components of the BCES to determine whether or not there are included within these components

the basic items of information which would permit relevant evaluation studies. To be useful for study designs and the construction of measurement instruments, a much finer level of detail will be required.

Programmatic Descriptor

1. What is the nature of the program? What projects are included? Subprojects?

2. What are the purposes and objectives of the program as seen by those implementing it?

3. What portions of the program are and are not implemented?

4. Who has the administrative responsibility for each part?

5. What are the reasons that any planned implementation has not taken place?

6. What are the effective (strong) points of the program? The ineffective (weak) points? (As seen by those implementing it).

7. How do each of the above six questions compare to the planned implementation of the program?

8. Who (what groups) are the direct participants in the program (at each level)?

9. Who (what groups) are those indirectly impacted by the program? In what ways?

10. How many (and what percentage) in each group defined are directly and indirectly impacted by the program?

5. Is target group performance different from that of similar, non-participating groups in more than one way? If so, how are these differences interrelated?

6. In what ways are the changes or differences characteristic of the target groups related to any or any combination of the program descriptor questions listed above?

7. Are there any changes or differences with respect to the target group on non-performance variables such as attitudes, attendance, dropouts, etc.

8. Are these interrelated among themselves or the descriptor questions?

9. Has non-target but directly related educational group performance, attitudes, attendance, and the like changed or shown differences (teachers, counselors, non-instructional personnel, para-professionals, administrative personnel, and the like)?

10. What are the interrelationships of the various variable for these groups?

Political/Policy Impact

1. Has the program received favorable or unfavorable publicity in the community?

2. What is the community attitude toward the need versus the program?

3. How do the parents feel toward the program?

4. Does the program meet needs expressed by community groups? By parents? By school board members? By state and local officials?

5. Does the program interface with other programs and projects currently receiving the support of local groups and agencies?

* *** *** *

It should be noted that the above list of questions represents a first effort to take the concerns of evaluation to a greater degree of refinement. Further efforts along these lines are planned for later phases of the project. Eventually, these refined evaluation questions will be cross-referenced against the components of the BCES at the specific data level, and a determination will be made of the specific data lacks which may exist in the system.

APPENDIX E

Descriptions of the following JCES instruments are presented in this appendix:

1. Universe File
2. ELSEGIS
3. Program Reference File
4. Consolidated Program Information Report
5. SEA-MES
6. Pupil Centered Instrument
7. Project Descriptor Questionnaire
8. AIR Project Evaluation Guide
9. Common Status Measures

The summaries presented below are based on detailed reviews of the JCES elements accomplished as part of the basis for a system analytic study of the developing JCES. The summaries were obtained by a close examination of the instruments themselves together with information obtained during talks with Office of Education staff members. Along with a general discussion of each instrument, a table giving an item by item description of the instrument content is presented.

1. Universe File

The National Center for Educational Statistics sends out once a year a brief questionnaire designed to gather certain items of very basic information about the schools and the school districts in the United States. The NCES Universe File is conceived as a basic sampling frame listing all schools by district within the states and regions of the country. It is intended that this file cover both public and

private schools and be the most up to date, appropriate, and complete listing of schools and districts in the country.

The kinds of information collected by the Universe File are as follows: a) Identification information including name of district, name of school, name of county, mailing address, area codes, telephone numbers, etc.; b) type of school in terms of private, public, and grade span; c) population served in terms of number of students by grade and number of graduates during the preceding school year; d) assignment; e) program information (proposed for 1969-70) in terms of whether or not each of five special programs are operating in the schools with or without Federal funding: handicapped, academically talented, compensatory, vocation/technical, and continuing education.

The following is an item by item description of the Universe File:

1. School status: closed or in operation.
2. USOE school code.
3. State's School code.
4. Name of School District.
5. Name and address of school.
6. Name of County where school is located.
7. Type of school: Elem, Middle, Sec., Voc/Tech, Area Voc.
8. State or Federally Operated School?
9. Number of pupils by grade.
10. Number of Graduates from Grade 12.
11. Number of teaching and Non-Teaching Professional Personnel at each of the following levels:
    - Pre-kindergarten
    - Kindergarten
    - Graded Elementary
    - Secondary
    - Special Education

12. Number of special programs operating and number operating with federal funds for each of the following groups:
    Handicapped
    Academically Talented
    Compensatory
    Vocational/Technical
    Continuing Education

2. Elementary and Secondary General Information System (ELSEGIS)

The ELSEGIS Program is conducted by the National Center of Educational Statistics and is intended to be a general purpose survey of basic data regarding public school systems. For some time, the emphasis in data collection by the National Center for Educational Statistics has been on the legislative requirements of programs such as the NDEA and the ESEA Acts. However, NCES felt a need to collect data on school systems in their entirety rather than solely in terms of program segments and a need to emphasize basic data in response to the general educational community needs. Therefore, the National Center for Educational Statistics and the Committee of Educational Data Systems of the Council of Chief State School Officers developed an approach to collection of general survey data for public schools. It must be understood that strictly speaking, the ELSEGIS effort is not a part of JCES, but the basic data which are collected on school systems seem to overlap considerably with data to be collected through the Program Reference File, and with data to be collected by the CPIR. The basic data tables contained in the last ELSEGIS report (1967) are as follows: 1) the number of schools in local public school systems by organizational level, grade

span; size of system; 2) enrollment and pupil teacher ratio in local public system by organizational level and size of school system; 3) instructional staff in local public school systems by position and size of system; 4) classroom teachers by highest level of education completed and size of school system; 5) current expenditures of local public system by account and size of school system; 6) current expenditures for pupil and average daily membership for local public system by account and size of system.

It is not our purpose here to examine in detail the extent to which there may be duplication of effort in the various data collection efforts associated with CPIR program efforts file and ELSEGIS. It should simply be noted that it will be our purpose at a later point in the present effort to take a critical look at the extent to which some of the information presently obtained by different forms can be combined in a single data collection effort. Thus, we may hold out the possibility that some aspect if not all of the ELSEGIS effort might be merged with CPIR, or vice versa.

In summary, the products to be expected out of the CPIR Instrument, in addition to its effectiveness in reducing the load on local educational agencies in meeting the reporting requirements, are reports covering dollars expended by sources of funding; services and programs provided by these funds; identification of the number of children by target

group needing services and the number of vices provided; in-service education by Federal source of funding. The instrument will for the first time provide a coordinated look with common descriptors at the various Federal funding programs impacting on local school districts, and will enable interested parties to trace the flow of dollars by Federal sources to the kinds of programs and services provided with respect to the kinds of children benefited.

The following is an item by item description of the ELSEGIS questionnaire:

1. Name and address of public school system.
2. Number of elementary and secondary schools by grade span.
3. Number of pupils enrolled in district in:
   - Nursery
   - Kindergarten
   - Elementary
   - Secondary
4. Number of Instructional staff by type
5. Number of teachers by level of education completed
6. Average daily attendance
7. Average daily membership
8. Yearly expenditures for
   - a. administration
   - b. teacher salaries
   - c. attendance services
   - d. health services
   - e. pupil transportation services
   - f. plant operation
   - g. plant maintenance
   - h. food services
   - i. student body activities
   - j. community services

3. Program Reference File

The concept of the Program Reference File is built on the cur-

rently existing National Center for Educational Statistics Universe File. See page E-1 of this Appendix. In order to be able to set up the kind of stratified sampling called for in employing the other measures in the Comprehensive Evaluation System, JCES personnel would like to add two questions to the NCES questionnaire. These two questions concern urbanization and a detailed inquiry of the nature and kinds of Federal programs to be found in the schools.

When PP&E analyzed the NCES Universe File, they quickly decided that the addition of these two items would be essential in order to provide the specific information concerning all different programs and projects funded by OE at various grade levels, and the population size from which the school draws its students. At the present time, however, there seems to be some question as to whether or not it is going to prove feasible to add these two additional questions to the proposed 1970 NCES questionnaire. If NCES were to add the items to their questionnaire, it would probably be necessary to print two variations, one for the Belmont schools (for program reference purposes) and one for the remaining schools. For this reason, two forms might have to be mailed out. And for this reason, NCES is hesitant to add the two questions. If NCES is unwilling to add these two questions to their form, it is likely that BCES will procede to send out its own questionnaire, duplicating much of the information on the NCES questionnaire, but adding the two questions referred to.

It is seen as essential that as this Program Reference File is developed, there also be developed sample generating procedures useful at both Federal and State levels. Additionally, as the Program Reference File is phased into the total project, it is essential that it become the single base for generating the samples to be used in collecting data for both the common management information report (district instrument) and the comprehensive evaluation system. To do otherwise negates the ability to interface data from both sources.

Individual States may choose to add additional items to their Program Reference File to meet their needs at the State level.

The technical Task Force, composed of both Federal and State representatives, has assumed responsibility for the development of the instrument to collect information for the Program Reference File and the software for a sample generating system. Development may be accomplished on contract, supported by USOE. The availability of required data will be determined in cooperation with participating State representatives. States will be responsible for conducting reviews with their local education agencies. The states will be responsible for data collection within their respective States each Fall. This will entail mailing of forms, verification of receipt of forms in the local agencies, assuring that all local agencies respond, and initial editing of the returns within their respective States. The Office of Education will be

responsible for processing of data and generating State-representative samples, subject to review and approval by each participating State.

Completion of the Program Reference File will allow the participating States to have a complete accounting of the projects operating in schools throughout their States. For example, States will be able to determine (1) the percentage and number of projects funded through ESEA, Title I which provide instruction in reading, arithmetic, science, etc., by grade level, (2) the number and proportion of elementary school which have projects funded through ESEA, Title I and projects funded through ESEA, Title III, (3) the number and proportion of schools which have both Federally supported reading and arithmetic projects in the fourth grade, and (4) the number proportion of schools within each school district providing services supported through Federal funds. Further, States will be able to draw representative samples of schools stratified on variables such as geographic location, urbanism grade spans, types of programs, etc. The Program Reference File will also be used at the Federal level to draw samples for installation of the other components of the total system decribed below.

Finally, an examination of the proposed PRF form raises several questions. First, it would be feasible and desirable to add one more dimension to questions concerning programs. The dimension proposed is the number of students participating in each program. This could be accom-

plished by having the person filling the form out use a percentage estimate or frequency count in the proper cell as opposed to indicating this with a check mark, as currently planned. The percentage estimate is viewed as the estimated percentage of students participating in each grade. This information would then be tied into a frequency estimate by using the percentage estimate in conjunction with the grade size to compute the number of students participating. With these figures available for each school, a more precise population estimate would be possible. In addition, it would provide a reliability check and/or tie in point with data obtained under the Project Descriptor Inventory.

Secondly, there are disturbing points about the use of two separate forms: 1) it defeats the purpose of Belmont to reduce forms; and 2) it raises the spectre of incompatible data. Of the two, the latter is more disturbing, since ultimately data about programs must be related to the information contained in the NCES file. Great care must be taken to insure this compability. This can be accomplished by the use of the same USOE code number for schools in each file or inventory.

If the above consideration can be attained then the use of the PRF inventory will furnish the data required for the PRF itself. In addition, adding the dimension of student participation will also facilitate sample planning and costing.

Listed below are the questions JCES personnel would like to add to the Universe File Questionnaire:

1. Population of community in which is located.
2. Population of largest community within 20 miles.
3. Crosstabs of programs from ESEA 1965, NDEA 1958, and Vocational Education Amendment 1968 by Grade Levels (Pre K-12)

4, Consolidated Program Information Report

Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR) represents the management information portion of the JCES. Historically state and local agencies have been forced to supply multitudinous statistical reports to fulfill Federal reporting requirements under the various legislative acts through which the government supports educational programs. In addition to the burden imposed by filling these many duplicatory and sometimes inadequate reports, there has been real difficulty in cross-collating the information contained therein to arrive at usual policy planning and managerial information. It is intended that the CPIR supplant many of these existing reports, drastically reducing the amount of punching and processing time, and providing a ready source for the information so necessary for policy and planning decisions.

The CPIR was developed by the program information committee of the Joint State/OE Task Force on Evaluation (the Belmont Group). The first of the CPIR forms was tried out in 1969 to collect FY 69 data, in a sample of 1500 nationally representative school districts. The results of this survey are expected to be available by January 1970.

The Fiscal 1970 Instrument will be distributed to Belmont representatives by the end of January 1970 for review and possible revision. It is expected that the Fiscal 70 survey will be conducted on a state by state sampling basis in all 50 states and will consist of about 4,000 local school districts, so that each state will have the opportunity to examine and process its own information.

In general, the 1970 Instrument differs from the 1969 Instrument in only minor ways. The desirability of introducing target groups as another dimension in the Instrument was reaffirmed by the Belmont Group, contingent upon the availability of the attribution guide, and some parts of Section IV (supplemental program information section) were chosen for elimination because of questionable use by state plans and program officers. The attribution guide is an adjunct to the CPIR which is to be developed for the purpose of attributing resources to programs in education. The proposed guide is intended to provide a means of attributing information contained in the accounting records to the services activities funding sources and target groups requested in the CPIR. It is hoped that a draft of this guide can be made available for use with the 1970 Instrument.

The program information committee of the Belmont Group also discussed the possibility of taking an active role in the development of a consolidated state evaluation form (see Section below) and a consoli-

dated application form. It was the consensus that it would be desirable for the Group to assume this role. No schedule was set for so doing, however. It will be recalled that the CPIR is intended to collect data regarding the following elementary and secondary programs; ESEA Title I, II, III, V (Flow through funds), VII and VIII; NDEA Titles III and V-A; Civil Right Title IV, and the Follow through program.

At the present time, the present form (1969) of the CPIR consists of a rather bulky booklet with a manual of instructions. Part I of this booklet contains identification and certification information with respect to the local education agency, number of pupil in public schools as of 1 October 1968; number of participants in Federal programs unspecified by public and non-public schools in regular and summer programs; number participating in Federal programs from various target populations (pupil population groups); and services and activities supplied in Federally aided programs by public school student level and non-public school.

The next section of the CPIR is concerned with staffing and reports, the number of professional staff member engaged in services and activities supported by Federal programs as a function of the level of school type of program and type of pupil population group; also by number of non-professional staff members by amount of participation and by extent of the program with respect to the regular school term. Also in this

section is personnel development data regarding the number of staff members engaged at each of several professional levels; assigned to in-service activities and training through Federally supported programs. In addition, dollar amounts by types and sources of Federal funds for in-service training are requested.

Part Three of the CPIR is concerned with program expenditures and provides amount expended by source of funds and according to several of the Federal source programs as function of type of service and activity conducted. This section is quite extensive and detailed in terms of the services and activities covered, and concludes with a summary of expenditure of Federal funds by instructional level.

Part Four is concerned with supplemental program information (it will be recalled that some of the 1969 CPIR content in this section is expected to be deleted for the 1970 Instrument). This section gives total counts of children who participated in public and non-public school summer school terms in the ESEA Title I Program for Children in Low Income Areas. It then gives counts by type of school and type of term for various grade levels participating in this program followed by a drop out information and number of program staff by school term type and level of program. Number of staff members receiving in-service or pre-service education is reported by level of professional school term number of training hours received. Services and activities are reported

in terms in of indicating those which are provided by type of school and grade level for both regular and summer terms. Average daily membership and number of children dropping out of school during the regular school term is given by Title I Public Schools and Other Public Schools and by grade level.

For the ESEA Title I Migratory Worker Children Program, similar information similar to that for low income children is collected. Section C of Part Four concerns similar information for the Follow Through Program, While Section D of Part Four is devoted to the Title II, ESEA. The Title II information begins with a summary of expenditures by categories and materials provided; indicates the number of teachers in the ESEA Title II program and the number of new school libraries established. It continues with the number of materials and expenditures for loans to children and teachers as a function of type and level of school and categories of materials.

Section E of Part Four concerns NDEA Title III and NFAHA Fiscal Year 69 expenditures for instructional materials and equipment by subject matter areas. Section F shows school membership by level, number of children by level, and adults and teachers receiving in-service training. It also shows the number and percent of children participating in Title III projects during Fiscal Year 69 by ethnic groups and by rural/urban and socio-economic groups. Further, a table indicates type of paid personnel by number of staff assigned to the projects as a function

of major program services type and level of schools and in-service training.

It can be seen from the above review that the information collected by the CPIR is extremely extensive with respect to program level and amount of participation in the local schools with respect to various programs supported by federal funds. In addition to the booklet of the form itself there is a manual explaining the treatment required for each of the categories of information and each of the tables to be filled out.

Implementation Schedule

The implementation of the CPIR has already begun on a sample basis. In the Fall of 1969 a sample of 830 school districts in all 50 states were chosen to be representative of all school districts that have ESEA Titles I or II, or NDEA III or V-A. In addition, all school districts not included in the above that had a migrant program or ESEA V, VII, VIII or Follow Through were included in the sample. Finally, all school districts not included that had ESEA Title III program were asked to complete the ESEA supplemental part. This sample resulted in approximately 1500 school districts filling out the CPIR in toto, and an additional 900 filling out the Title III supplements. Data analysis for these administrations is underway.

The 1970 survey with the CPIR will be conducted in all 50 states and 4,000 local school districts. Each state will have a sample for its own information and analysis.

The following is an item by item description of the Consolidated Program Information Report (CPIR)

General

1. Name and address of Local Education Agency (LEA).
2. LEA Representative.
3. State Education Agency Official who approved report.
4. Grade spans of elementary and secondary schools.

Pupils and Schools

1. Public school membership by grade level.
2. Number pupils who participated in federally aided programs in public and non-public schools by grade level during regular school term and summer term.
3. Number of children (ages 5-18) in school district by pupil populations group (handicapped, migrant, delinquent, etc.)
4. Number of pupils in public and non-public schools by pupil population group who participated in federally aided programs.
5. Number public and non-public schools which conducted federally aided programs for each of the pupil population groups.
6. Number pupils in federally aided programs by type of service or activity during regular school term and summer term by school level (Elem., Se., Pr. K & K)

Staffing

1. Number of professional staff members (full-time and part-time) for federally aided programs during full regular school term for each of the pupil population groups by type of service rendered:
   (a) Direct educative services
   (b) Supporting services
2. Number of non-professional staff member (full-time and part-time) during full regular school term for each of the pupil population groups.
3. Number of professional staff members (full-time and part-time) for federally funded programs that listed only a part of the regular school term for each of the pupil population groups by type of service rendered: direct educative services and supporting services.
4. Number of non-professional staff member (full-time and part-time) for programs that lasted only a part of the regular school term for each of the pupil population groups.

5. Number of professional staff members (full-time and part-time) for federally aided programs during the summer term for each of the pupil population groups by type of service rendered: direct educative services and supporting services.
6. Number of non-professional staff members (full-time and part-time) during summer term for each of the pupil population groups.
7. Number of staff members in district assigned to work in programs designed to meet needs of the target group.
8. Number of staff members who received in-service training through federally aided programs.
9. Amount of funds expended for in-service training by Title.

Program Expenditures

1. Amount of funds expended by Title for each of the various services and activities provided in federally aided programs.
2. Amount of funds expended by instructional level (Pre K, K, 1-12, Post 12, dropouts, Adults).

Supplemental Program Information

A. ESEA Title I - LEA Program for Children in Low Income Areas
   1. Number of children who participated in public and non-public schools.
   2. Number of schools and pupils who participated by grade level during regular and summer school terms.
   3. Number of children who were dropouts prior to participating in regular or summer school program.
   4. Number of staff members by type and grade level during regular and summer school term.
   5. Number of staff members by type who received in-service or pre-service training and number of hours of such training.
   6. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level (K, 1-6, 7-12) by type of service or activity during regular school term.
   7. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level by type of activity or service during summer term.
   8. Average Daily membership and number of dropout from Title I public school and non-Title I Public Schools.

B. ESEA Title I - LEA Program for children of migratory workers
   1. Number of intrastate and interstate migratory children participating in program.
   2. Number of participants in public and private schools during

regular and summer terms by grade level (pre K, K, 1-6, 7-12)

3. Number of staff members by type and grade level during regular and summer terms.
4. Number of staff members by type who received in-service and pre-service training and number of hours of such training.
5. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level (K, 1-6, 7-12) by type of service or activity during regular school term.
6. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level (K, 1-6, 7-12) by type of service or activity during summer term.

C. Follow Through Program

1. Number of children participating in public and non-public schools.
2. Number of participants in public and non-public schools. during regular and summer terms by grade level (K, 1-2,3).
3. Number of staff members by type and grade level during regular and summer terms.
4. Number of staff members by type who received in-service and pre-service training and number of hours of such training.
5. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level (K, 1-3) by type of service or activity during regular school term.
6. Number of children in public and non-public schools by grade level by type of service or activity during summer term.

D. ESEA Title II

1. Total expenditures for textbooks, school library and other instructional resources from state and local funds and private funds (for non-public schools).
2. Number of teachers participating in public and non-public schools.
3. Number of new public school libraries established under the Title in elementary and secondary schools.
4. Number of materials and amount of funds expended by item category for loan to pupils and teachers at elementary and secondary public schools.
5. Number of materials and amount of funds expended by item category of loan to pupils and teachers at elementary and secondary non-public schools.

E. NDEA Title III and NFAHA, FY 69

Expenditures by subject area for instructional materials and equipment (for audiovisual and other materials and equipment separately).

F. ESEA Title III

1. School membership and number of participants by grade level in public and private schools. Also number of teacher who receive in-service training and number of adult participants.
2. Number and percent of participants by ethnic and racial group.
3. Rural/Urban distribution of participating children.
4. Number of full and part-time staff member by type.
5. Number participants by program or service in public schools by grade level and in non-public schools. Also number of adult participants and number of teacher receiving in-service training by program or service.
6. Total cost by program or service.

5. State Evaluation Agency -- Management Evaluation Survey (SEA-MES)

The SEA Management Evaluation Survey is an Instrument designed to collect information which is required in order to evaluate the management and administration of OE projects at the state level. At the moment, this instrument is in the initial planning stage with a working draft planned for presentation at the second quarterly Belmont meeting sometime in July 1970. The instrument itself is viewed as a questionnaire similar in design to the Consolidated Program Information Report. In this instrument, questions will be limited to details about the management of the program. For example, they will deal with areas such as:

What programs do you administer?

What types of people assist you in managing these projects?

How many of each type, etc.?

The information accumulated will then by analyzed and used to evaluate how effectively the program was managed.

See discussion of developmental requiremnts in body of report (Page).

6. Pupil Centered Instrument

The purpose of the Pupil Centered Instruments will be to gather information on school districts, individual schools, teachers, and pupils. Part of this instrument will be aimed at determining the extent to which individual pupils participate in the various programs and activities described through the Project Descriptor. In addition, the instrument will allow for the determination of the background and characteristics of the individual pupils participating in the programs.

The Pupil Centered Instrument will consist of four basic components:

School District Questionnaire

Principal Questionnaire

Teacher Questionnaire

Pupil Questionnaire

These questionnaires are based upon revisions of the 1969 Survey on Compensatory Education but the data collected by the 1970 instruments will be applicable to the evaluation of several programs in addition to ESEA Title I. The 1970 instrument for elementary schools will be implemented in the Spring of 1970 in a nationally representative sample of school districts from all fifty states. As with the 1969 Survey, the grades sampled will be grades 2, 4, and 6. Teachers will be requested to complete the pupil questionnaires for no more than 4 of their students. The secondary school instrument has not been developed and will not be used in this year's survey.

The Development Task Force for the Pupil Centered Instruments anticipates that new questions will be developed for the 1970 instruments. Questions will be developed to provide data on guidance, counseling, and occupational orientation programs for elementary school pupils. Since a complete description of available programs and services is desired, new questions will be developed to gauge the appropriateness, adequacy, accessibility, and use of the facilities, materials, and equipment that are available to districts, schools, and pupils. Finally, because of the complexities of local program administration, data will not be requested according to the Federal funding title providing the services. Only two questions of a general nature will be included in the School District and Principal Questionnaires relating services to funding source.

The following is an item by item description of the four questionnaires.

1969 Pupil Centered Instrument - School District Questionnaire

General Information

1. Number of public schools in district by grade span.
2. Annual salary for starting elementary school teacher.
3. Maximum salary for elementary school teacher.

Test Data Information

1. Names of achievement test batteries, levels and forms of pre-tests and post-tests and dates of test administrations in Grade 2,4,6.
2. Most recent dates the following types of tests were administered in Grade K-12: reading readiness

Arithmetic or Math
Language
Foreign Language
Intelligence

3. Type of norm groups used to compute scores for Grades 2, 4, 6.
4. Conversion tables for local norms (if used).

ESEA Title I Information*

1. Amount of funds approved for use in FY69 (Title 1).
2. Number of school pupils who received services funded by ESEA, Title I by grade.
3. Number of public schools providing programs and services funded by ESEA, Title I by grade.
4. Basis used for allocating funds from ESEA Title I.

*For the 1970 questionnaire, this section will be revised where appropriate.

Parent Involvement Information

1. Method of securing parent involvement in ESEA,Title I program.
2. Total number of ESEA, Title I Citizens' Advisory Committees active in district.**
3. Did State Dept. of Education give assistance or advice in creating Citizens' Advisory Committees?**
4. Concerns of Citizens Advisory Committees.
5. Duties of Citizens' Advisory Committees.**
6. Primary methods of selection of different types of persons serving on the Citizens' Advisory Committees.**

** These items will be eliminated from 1970 questionnaire.

Personnel Training Information***

1. Amount of ESEA Title I funds expended for support of in-service training programs.
2. Number of personnel by type who have participated in in-service training program funded by ESEA Title I.
3. Have classroom teachers participated in in-service training programs funded by ESEA Title I which incorporated joint training with teacher aides, other professional personnel of parents?
4. Main objectives in In-Service training program supported by ESEA Title I for the different types of school personnel.
5. Subject matter for ESEA Title I funded In-Service Training Programs.
6. Grade levels of instructional techniques covered by the ESEA Title I funded In-Service Training Programs.

***For 1970, this section will be modified to include all programs.

6. Do teachers use instructional resources from reference centers outside the school.
7. Number of classrooms for grades K-6 with following equipment:
   (a) Projection screen.
   (b) Light control for projection.
   (c) In-room terminals for T.V. antenna.
   (d) In-room connections for closed-circuit T.V.
   (e) Independent study stations.
   (f) Electrical outlets.
8. Does school provide material or equipment to acquaint pupils with Vocational Education Programs?
9. Copyright date of most frequently used texts in math and reading in regular school program in grades 2,4, and 6.

Student Body Description

1. Percent of pupils from minority groups.
2. Percent of pupils whose families are on a public welfare program.
3. Percent of pupils whose parents did not complete 8th Grade.
4. Are standardized reading achievement test results available?
5. Percent of 6th grade pupils who are at least one grade level but less than two grade levels below national norms in reading achievement.
6. Percent of 6th grade pupils who are at least two grade levels or more below national norms in reading achievement.

1969 Pupil Centered Instrument - Teachers Questionnaire

Teachers Background Information

1. Grade taught.
2. Sex.
3. Years of full-time teaching experience.
4. Years of teaching in this particular school.
5. Reside within attendance area of school?
6. Member of minority group?
7. Number of days of absence when school was in session.
8. Reason for teaching at this particular school.
9. Training in teaching academically disadvantaged children.
10. Hours of participation in formal in-service training concerned with academically disadvantaged children.
11. Participation in in-service training program concerned with vocation guidance or occupational information for elementary pupils.
12. Indicate whether any of the services listed below has been provided and whether they have been funded by ESEA Title I.

(a) Classroom aides.
(b) Consultants.
(c) Tuition fees for college or summer institute.
(d) Professional travel.

Class Characteristics and Organization

1. Number of pupils in class from families on welfare.
2. Primary source of information used to respond to above item.
3. Percent of pupils in class that are members of minority groups.
4. Percent of pupils in class that are performing below grade level in reading.
5. Number of pupils in class on each of two dates.
6. Number of pupils entering class between two dates.
7. Number of pupils leaving class between two dates.
8. Number of teachers that have held your teaching assignment, with your class for at least two consecutive weeks.
9. Percent of pupils participating in programs for the academically disadvantaged in the following subjects: math, reading, language, other academic subjects.
10. When do students participate in program for the academically disadvantaged in math, reading, language and other academic subjects: before school, after school, weekends, or during regular school day.
11. Description of classroom organization: specialist teachers, teaching aides, team teaching, non-graded classes, departmentalized grouping by ability, etc.

Teaching Method

1. Description of instructional program: regular, academic disadvantaged, enrichment.
2. Indicate subject areas and programs which you regularly teach: reading, math, language/enrichment, programs for the academcially disadvantaged.

Program of Instruction in Your Class

1. How are pupils grouped for instruction in math, reading, language?
2. Number of minutes per instructional period in math, reading, and language.
3. Number of instructional periods per week in math, reading, language.
4. Number of weeks of instruction in math, reading, language.
5. Description of approach to material presentation in math, reading, and language: topic, subject matter, unit, skills, or activity centered.

6. Description of curriculum approaches or concepts in math, reading and language.
7. Types of responses expected from pupils in reading, math, and language after some material has been presented.
8. Educational objectives emphasized in reading, math, and language.

Teacher Concerns*

1. Is class progress hampered by individual differences of pupils?
2. Discipline problems.
3. Adequacy of equipment and materials available.
4. Appropriateness of equipment and materials
5. Do you have a part in chosing the classroom curricula?
6. Are programs for the academically disadvantaged generally worthwhile?
7. Description of classroom activities:
   (a) Giving mild or strong approved or disapproval of pupil actions.
   (b) Extending, modifying, or elaborating upon pupil ideas
   (c) Asking questions of pupils.
   (d) Giving direction to pupils.
   (e) Listening to pupils.
8. Teacher opinions on various matters of teaching.**

* This section will be reduced in the 1970 questionnaire.

** This item will be eliminated in the 1970 questionnaire.

1969 Pupil Centered Instrument - Pupil Questionnaire.

General Information

1. Pupil's grade level.
2. Pupil's sex.
3. Pupil's month and year of birth.
4. Month of school year that pupil started class.
5. Number of days of absence.
6. Were absences due to illness?
7. Since first grade, how many schools has this pupil attended?
8. Is pupil:
   (a) from an institution for neglected children.
   (b) from an institution for delinquent children.
   (c) from an agricultural migrant family.
9. School experience before first grade.

Pupil Background Information

1. Member of minority group.

2. Language other than English primarily spoken in home.
3. Occupation of Father.
4. Pupil's family on public welfare?
5. Estimate of family income.
6. Source of information for family income.
7. Relationship of head of pupil's household to pupil.
8. Is pupil's household head employed?
9. Educational level of head of household and Mother.
10. Is Mother employed?
11. Description of area near pupil's home: residential, rural, residential and commerical.
12. Considering present attitude, how far will pupil go in school?
13. Considering ability, how far will pupil go in school?
14. Educational aspiration of parents for pupil.
15. Have you had any communication with parent during school year?
16. Nature of communication.
17. Reading level of pupil.
18. According to pupil's critical needs, what program do you recommend for him?

Academic Program Participation Information

1. Does pupil participate in regular programs in math, reading, language?
2. Number of programs for academically disadvantaged or enrichment programs in which pupil participates in math, reading, language.
3. On what basis was pupil placed in these programs.
4. Average size of instructional group for each program.
5. Number of minutes per instructional period for each program.
6. Number of instructional periods per week for each program.
7. Number of weeks for each program.
8. Curriculum approaches or concepts for each program.

Ancillary Program Participation Information

1. Types of cultural enrichment programs in which pupil participated.
2. Total number of hours in all cultural enrichment programs.
3. Has pupil participated in a health service program in school?
4. Which of following health services were provided:
   (a) Physical, dental, or eye examinations
   (b) Treatment or therapy.
   (c) Other.
5. Has pupil participated in programs for treating social, emotional, or disciplinary problems?
6. Does pupil receive free or reduced price food in school?
7. How much has pupil benefited from ancillary service program?

Summer Programs

1. Did pupil participate in reading, math, or language summer program?
2. Length of program in weeks and hours per week.
3. Cultural enrichment program during summer - type.
4. Number of hours spent in cultural enrichment program during summer.

Pupil Behavior

1. Changes in pupil's academic performance and behavior.
2. Percent of time spent in: academic work, other learning activities, disruptive behavior, other non-constructive behavior.
3. Interests in math, reading, and language.

Test Performance

1. Has pupil taken a standardized achievement test since Sept. 1967; between Sept. 1967 and Dec. 1968?
2. Month and year of pre-test administration.
3. Name, level, and form of test.
4. Have pupil's scores been reported to school?
5. Pre-test scores of pupil: reading, arithmetic, language.
6. Were tests part of regular school program or administered in relation to compensatory education?
7. Has pupil taken a standardzied achievement test since Jan. 1969?
8. Month and year of test administration.
9. Name, level, and form of test.
10. Have pupils scores been reported to school?
11. Post-test scores for pupil: reading, arithmetic, language.
12. Were tests part of regular school program or administered in relation to compensatory education.

Supplementary Pupil Information*

1. People who live with this pupil in house or apartment.**
2. Have parents talked to pupil about college?
3. Have parents discussed with pupil occupational choice?
4. What materials does pupil read outside of school?**
5. Does pupil belong to Boy or Girl Scouts, etc.?
6. Does pupil take art or music lessons outside of school?
7. Before first grade did anyone teach pupil alphabet, etc.?
8. What would make parents happier? Doing well in school work or acting very badly?
9. What would make parents unhappier? Doing badly in school work or

behaving very badly.

10. Source of information of above.

* This section will be reduced considerably for the 1970 questionnaire.

** These items will be eliminated from the 1970 questionnaire.

7. Project Descriptor Instrument

The Program Reference File for any selected school will contain information on the general types of programs at different grade levels, as well as the funding sources for these programs. By drawing a sample, or samples, from the Program Reference File and by administering a Project Descriptor Instrument to the schools in the sample, specific descriptions of projects and activities operating as components in any general program can be developed.

More importantly, this will enable these projects or activities to be related to data gathered through a Pupil Centered Instrument. For example, inferences about what kinds of activities produce what kinds of results for what kinds of children will be possible.

The projector descriptor instrument will be designed to gather the following types of information:

1. Type of project or activity; e.g., remedial math
2. Source of funding for project or activity
3. Duration of project or activity
4. Number of participants and background characteristics of participants
5. Organization for instruction, including teaching methods employed

6. Facilities, equipment, and materials utilized.

The Project Descriptor Instrument is being developed under contract to Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey. The project director has stated that the object of the Project Descriptor Instrument is to obtain data sufficiently detailed to allow differentiation among educational treatments. The instrument, therefore, contains items descriptive of target groups, plant equipment, materials, personnel, and services. Information is to be reported about each project where a project is basically defined as a collection of people, goods and services for which application was made and funds received. (It should be noted that some projects are difficult to define and that the Projector Descriptor Instrument provides a series of decision rules for deciding when a project should be subdivided for reporting).

The Project Descriptor Instrument has been built to measure the categories in a taxonomy of project program activities which was developed as a part of the ETS contract. The specific questions in the Project Descriptor Instrument are designed to cover the various categories of the taxonomy. For this reason, the taxonomy will be summaried below.

There are sixteen major categories in the taxonomy:

I. Identification of Project Program Activity

This category contains the title or description of the project, the control number, information about the project director, and the administration of the project.

II. Funding

This category contains information about the source of Federal funds for the project and the status of the request for Federal funds in terms of requested, approved or received, and the fiscal years in question. It covers all of the sources of Federal funds discussed earlier with the exception of Civil Rights Title IV. This category goes on the cover the relevance of specified Federal funds, state regulations and priorities on the distribution of funds, and sources of any other Federal funds for this project program or activity.

III. Duration of the Project

IV. Location of the Project

This category is expressed in terms of geographic or administrative units, economic characteristics, location, population and ethnic composition.

V. Project Related Needs of the Impact Area

This category covers type of need ranging from improved or expanded educational technology to improved plant or facilities; awareness of needs; and draws on students, teachers, parents, school systems, and communities as sources.

VI. Project Delimitation

This category covers the specification of the use of the support with respect to planning, implementation of existing plans in terms of construction, rental, purchase, remodeling, and development, etc. It also covers personnel, services and scope of the project.

VII. Target Groups

Target groups are defined in sub-categories such as pupils, broken down to public and non-public, ethnic composition, sex, socio-economic status, special characteristics, eligibility and procedures for selection; local educational agency as a target group including public and non-public school, grade levels, ethnic composition, socio-economic status selection; and, finally, groups influential in setting educational goals such as state school board members, state education agencies, community leaders, parent-community advisors, etc.

VIII. Physical Plant

School buildings and property: types of facilities, location in respect to impact area, availability, and adequacy; non-school building and property: types of facility, location, availability, and adequacy.

IX. Equipment

Type of equipment and adequacy.

X. Materials and Supplies

Type, ranging over art to driver education adequacy.

XI. Personnel

Professional instructional personnel: Types, adequacy; non-professional instructional personnel: Types, adequacy.

XII. Non-instructional Services

For pupils, for local, or state agencies; objectives of such service, and duration of time of such services. Services covered in these categories

range from library, counseling, and welfare to statistical data processing, surveying needs, etc.

XIII. Instructional Services Initiated, Continued or Expanded

A. For pupils: types of services, objective of the services, duration of the services; B. For state local education agencies: types of services, objective of the services, and duration; C. Methodology: for student groupings and techniques, approaches, classroom activities, teacher-student interactions.

XIV. Planning Methodology

A. By participants; B. By qualification of the leader; C. Sharing of Responsibility; D. Planning of the Product.

XV. Evaluation

A. Data from individuals and from teachers; various kinds of tests and measures, interviews, achievement, etc.; From documents: Design of evaluation, the evaluators, their affiliations, qualifications, amount of time, involvement of planning and products.

XVI. Dissemination

Targets: Local education agencies, teachers, students school board, etc.; community targets, state education agency targets, professional targets. Form of dissemination: Written or oral, and sub-categories: author of dissemination material project director, evaluator, instructional staff, others.

The Project Descriptor Instrument as it stands in its present, pre-test form is a very long and cumbersome instrument. However, it should be noted that there are to be several parts to the Project Descriptor Instrument one each to be filled out by the school district project coordinator or director, the principal, and the teacher. Also, the Project Descriptor Instrument was not originally intended to contain outcome data. However, the present plan involves the development of additional outcome questions for the Project Descriptor Instrument so that in the event that Pupil Centered Instruments do not produce outcome data for some reason, there will be some outcome data available through this source. Tentatively outcome questions might included information about numbers of pupils in various categories, attendance and perhaps an achievement test score...etc.

Pretest of Project Description Taxonomy

The Project Descriptor Taxonomy was pre-tested during the month of November in the Belmont states of Texas, Washington, Connecticut, North Dakota and Maryland. Each of the five states were requested to provide OE with a list of 80 federal projects operating in their states. These 80 federal projects were chosen on the basis of the following criteria:

1. Level of operation-elementary or secondary requiring roughly projects from each level.
2. Grade of operation--some projects for all grades should be included

3. Subject of project--either academic or special service areas requiring roughly 40 projects in each area and including at least two or three staff development projects.
4. Urbanism of school districts offering projects--either urban, suburban, or rural.

Of the 80 projects for which descriptions were to be provided, only 20-30-were to be pretested. OE made the contacts with the participating project directors and school districts. ETS mailed the project descriptor taxonomy for the follow-up with the participants.

Project descriptor instrument data analyses will provide detailed investigations of the services provided through each Federal legislative title. For example, reports will indicate the structure, methodology, materials, equipment and personnel used in projects in compensatory reading in secondary schools. The frequency of use of various techniques will be reported for the 1969-70 school year and the relative frequency of use of various techniques will be reported for the techniques, facilities, materials, etc. Because of project descriptor will include information on the types of pupils participating in projects, analyses will report the kinds of services being rendered various kinds of pupils within states. When the entire system is implemented, the relative effectiveness of various kinds of services for various kinds of pupils will be reported. The initial year reports will include analyses of the character of secondary school projects by subject area and by source of funding within States and for the 20 states in aggregate. Program managers in State agencies will thus

have comprehensive pictures of the kinds of services each of the Federal programs is supporting in their States.

The following is an item by item description of the Project Descriptor Questionnaire:

General

1. Title of Project
2. Project SDE number
3. USOE contract number
4. Name and address of individual wit' major responsibility for project Also, Phone number, Job Title, and affiliation
5. Name of Agency administering project

Funding

6. Amount of federal funds requested for current FY by Title
7. Amount of federal funds received for current FY by Title
8. Amount of federal funds requested for all prior years by Title
9. Amount of federal funds received for all prior years by Title
10. Total time period for project supported by Federal funds
11. Anticipated amount of time that project will continue to receive federal funds
12. Total project expenditure through end of current FY
13. Were funds received on time? If not, any problems?
14. Amount of federal funds received for current FY by Funding Source or Agency
15. Amount of federal funds received for all prior years by Funding Source or Agency
16. Amount of State funds received during current FY
17. Amount of State funds received during all prior years
18. Amount of funds other than federal and state received for current FY by type of source.
19. Amount of funds other than federal and state for all prior years by type of source
20. Total project time period to date supported by any source
21. Anticipated future period of funding from any source

Impact Area

22. Unit of impact area - state, county, school, etc.

23. Average income of impact area
24. Unemployment rate
25. Per Pupil Expenditure for all public schools serving area
26. Population
27. Minority group percentages
28. Urbanism of area
29. List of needs. Rate degree to which need characterized impact area before inception of project. Rate relevance of project to need. Needs related to educational problems and funds.
30. Considering the above needs, identify agencies or persons who informed project executive group about urgency of these needs.

Project Planning

31. Who participated in planning? (groups or types of people)
32. Qualifications of people in charge of planning
33. Amount of sharing of responsibility among planners
34. Percent of total project staff man-hours devoted to planning
35. Projects of planning

Dissemination of Project Information

36. What groups received project information?
37. Form of project information (newspapers, TV, public lectures, etc.)
38. Authors of project information

Evaluation

39. Organization affiliation of person doing evaluation
40. Professional background of evaluator
41. Was evaluator involved in project planning?
42. Percent of project man-hours devoted to evaluation
43. Experimental design used
44. Evaluation product
45. Data used

Sub-Project

46. Number of Sub-projects
47. Crosstab of types of goods, services, and people by sub-project

The remaining portion of the questionnaire is completed separately for each sub-project.

General

1. Name, address, phone number, job title, and affiliation of person responsible for sub-project.

Target Group

2. Number of persons in target group, by grade level for public and non-public schools separately.
3. Ethnic compositions of target group
4. Number of males and females in target group
5. Number of person in target group whose families are on welfare
6. Categorization of target group by its particular social problem. Categorization of school personnel by job title.
7. How was eligibility for participation in project determined?
8. How were target group members selected?

Adult Community Members of Target Group

9. Number of adult community members of target group by minority group
10. Number of adult community member on public welfare
11. How were adult community members selected?
12. Adult community groups that are part of target groups (School Board, business leaders, etc.)

Facilities

13. What facilities and buildings do funds pay for?
14. Do physical plant and facilities that were paid for by funds belong to public school?
15. What public school facilities are involved in the project and how much money was spent on each?
16. Location of public school facilities in relation to impact area
17. Distance and availability of public school facilities to target group
18. Adequacy of public school facilities
19. What non-public school facilities are involved in the project and how much money was spent on each?
20. Distance and availability of non-public school facilities
21. Adequacy of non-public school facilities

Equipment and Materials

22. Does project receive funds for planning purchase, purchase, or planning the use of equipment and materials?

23. What types of equipment and materials are involved and how much money was spent on each?
24. Adequacy of equipment and materials

Objectives

25. Objectives of services provided in sub-project

Personnel

26. Does project receive funds for planning and/or use of instructional and non-instructional personnel?
27. Number of non-instructional personnel by type (planned and used)
28. Adequacy of non-instructional personnel
29. Number of professional instructional personnel by type (planned and used)
30. Adequacy of professional instructional personnel
31. Number of non-prefessional instructional personnel by type (planned and used)
32. Adequacy of non-prefessional instructional personnel.

Instructional Activities

33. Does project provide funds for planning and/or implementing instructional activities for pupils or school personnel?
34. Types of instructional activities for pupils.
35. Duration of instructional activities for pupils
36. When does instructional activities for pupils take place? - in school, after school, weekend, etc.
37. Objectives of instructional activities
38. Types of instructional activities for school personnel
39. Duration of instructional activities for school personnel
40. When do instructional activities for school personnel take place? - in school, after school, weekends, etc.

Non-Instructional Services

41. Types of non-instructional services for school personnel. Amount of funds for each of these services
42. Types of non-instructional services for pupils. Amount of funds for each of these services.
43. When are non-instructional services for pupils available? In school, after school, etc.

Instructors

44. Number of instructors used in sub-project.

The following items are to be completed by instructors:

Methods of Instruction

1. How are students grouped for instructional activities?
2. Instructional approaches (Classroom, independent, seminar, tutoring, P.I., etc.)
3. Teaching techniques
4. Instructional approaches (tapes, subject matter, unit, skills, activity centered, etc.)
5. Time devoted to teacher-, student-, and teaching-guide suggested activities
6. Time devoted to textbook
7. Percent of class assignments given to whole class (same assignment for all students) as opposed to individual assignments.
8. Time devoted to supplementary reading outside of main textbook
9. Types of teacher - pupil interaction (teacher leads, teacher demonstrates, teacher directs, student initiate, student questions, etc.)

8. The AIR Guide

While the Project Descriptor Instrument is intended to be used in all of the Belmont states to supply project and program description material, an additional instrument or device, the AIR Guide for preparing Evaluation Reports of Educational Programs, is intended to supplement the Project Descriptor Instrument. The AIR Guide was developed in response to the need identified by the Belmont group to supply some help to local evaluation personnel in their efforts to produce evaluation information useful in reporting to the state and Federal agencies. The kinds of reports produced with the use of this Guide are expected to be narrative reports describing the evaluation efforts at the local level. They

should, however, be complementary to the information described in the project descriptor.

It is of course a common requirement these days for the local education agency to be required to produce a report covering its own evaluation of an education program. The AIR Guide is intended to help the local evaluation team to decide what to include and how to report it. In the first of the sections of the Guide there are contained suggestions about the material which should be included to describe the setting (situation, context, background) of the program being evaluated. The second section is concerned with the description of the program itself (and it is here that the narrative report produced is to be complementary to the information supplied by the Project Descriptor Instrument. In fact it has been proposed that the Descriptor Taxonomy be included as an Appendix to the Guide). Thirdly the Guide provides a discussion of the methods of reporting evidence of change brought about by the program in question; and finally, the format and nature of recommendations which may be made on the basis of the evidence discussed.

The Guide attempts to be all things to all people, and freely points out that some of the sample questions, some of the organizing framework, and some of the examples do not pertain to all the programs. But it encourages the local evaluation personnel to select from amongst those

aspects of the presentation which are most relevant. In general, each section in the Guide includes framework questions referring to matters which might be important in writing the report. These are generally followed by explanations, examples, definitions and the like. Finally, model answers or model narrative statements are offered as a guide to handling each of these sections.

In addition to its ostensible use as a guide and aide to writing local evaluation reports, it is quite likely that the AIR Guide could be used as the framework of a training instrument in which some local personnel may be taught some of the key and important characteristics to be concerned with in designing and carrying out evaluation work.

9. Common Status Measures

In order to describe the basic level of the pupils participating in the programs, a portion of the Pupil/Project-Centered Information System was designated the Common Status Measures. The common status measures include two basic scales, one entitled Basic Verbal Status (literacy) and the other entitled Occupational Cognizance (Occupational Awareness). The Occupational Cognizance scale is designed to assess the 4th and 1th grade student's knowledge of occupations and his expectations with respect to occupations and educational experiences. The plan calls for the development of several tests forms each having 12 items, 10 items of the four choice type covering questions concerning education or training required for specified occupations, the nature of work involved in

specified occupations, recognition of other occupations related to a specific occupation, and recognition of field of work corresponding to a specified occupation. In addition to items on these topics each form will contain one question each concerning occupational expectations and educational expectations.

The Basic Verbal Status scale is also intended to apply to fourth and eleventh grade students and each test form will have again 12 questions. Basic skills being measured are vocabulary recognition and reading comprehension rather than concept formation, reasoning analogies and the like. The Vocabulary section of the test is concerned with synonyms and category relationships and the distractors are chosen according to principles of selecting mis-leads in the following areas: 1) paradigmatic association, 2) syntagmatic association, 3) spelling similarity, 4) phonological association, 5) phonological similarity, and 6) opposities. In the category relationships the student is asked to find a work from among the options that does not belong in the same category as the other three words.

The reading comprehension test is of a form in which the student is asked to read a relatively short passage and to choose from among four sentences the one sentence which makes a clear re-statement about something that appeared in the passage. The test does not emphasize generalizations or inferences.

It might be noted in passing that the length proposed for these tests does not suggest that they will have a particularly high degree of reliability. Perusal of the item pool suggests that the items are reasonably appropriate examples of the types described above.

Items included in the Common Status Measures are as follows:

Basic Verbal Status (12 items)

1. Vocabulary - synonyms and semantic categories
2. Reading comprehension.

Occupational Cognizance (12 items)

1. Knowledge of occupation.
   (a) Education or training required for specified occupation.
   (b) Nature of work involved in specified occupations.
   (c) Recognition of other occupations related to specified occupation.
   (d) Recognition of the field of work corresponding to a specified occupation.
2. Occupational expectations - choose from list the occupation he is most likely to have as an adult or the one that is most like the one he expects to follow.
3. Educational expectations - the student is asked to indicate his educational plans upon leaving high school.